

LOCAL OPTION AT CHANGANACHERY.

MR. P. GOMATINAYAKAM PILLAI (*Ag. Excise Commissioner*): I take permission from the President to announce to the House that it has been decided by Government to try local option within the Municipal area of Changanachery. For the time being, it is to be confined to the vend of arrack alone. The arrack shops have not been sold now. The President of the Municipality will be requested to know the sense of population through the voters of the Municipality and if 75 per cent of the voters will announce their desire to close the shops within the municipal area the shops will be closed and they will not be reopened.

MR. K. P. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil*): Suppose the majority of the people desire to close the shops why should the Government stipulate 75 per cent?

MR. P. GOMATINAYAKAM PILLAI (*Ag. Excise Commissioner*): I have now given an idea of the proposals on hand.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.—(*contd.*)FORESTS. (*contd.*)

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): Sir, I request that I may be permitted to say a few words on the point of order raised last evening.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): It is open of course to Mr. Thanu Pillai or anybody else to do that. But I may bring to the notice of the House that Mr. Muruvellil Pachu Pillai wants only to abolish the establishment of the Forest Settlement Officer. He has stated that he does not want the question of any principle to be discussed.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum*): I wish to bring to the notice of the House that it has been the practice to discuss such motions and not only to discuss them but also to vote upon them. The ruling that was referred to yesterday is in Vol. III of the Council Proceedings and that ruling is by no means against discussion or voting. This is how it reads:—

"I have explained the matter. It is a very difficult point and it is a matter of very great importance. I am aware of the fact that, in the Madras Legislative Council, such motions are allowed and perhaps voted upon. Here also it is true that we discussed such motions, but I think last year some of these motions were in fact definitely accepted, while there was no discussion on those not accepted by Government. It must be essentially left to the Government to decide, after being influenced by the discussion, whether to accept such motion which involves the abolition of a non-votable appointment or not."

So, it is clear from this ruling that non-votable items which involve the abolition of establishments could be discussed. Again it reads:—

"But if the motion is to be pressed to a division and if the House votes and carries the motion it can only mean that the Government will take into consideration either the abolition or reduction as the case may be and give effect to it if it thinks fit."

As for this ruling, there is absolutely nothing in it so far as I can see, against either the discussion of the motion or reference to non-votable appointments or against voting upon it.